

# **Interview Summary**

**Application No.**

09/618,550

**Applicant(s)**

TANIGUCHI

**Examiner**

Hung Henry V Nguyen

**Art Unit**

2851

#11

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hung Henry V Nguyen.

(3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) David A Bilodeau.

(4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 4/10/03Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.


If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-25 and 43-48.Identification of prior art discussed: Ushida et al and Okamoto et al.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
HENRY HUNG NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant submitted proposed amendment. Distinctions between the applied prior art and the amended claims were pointed out by applicant. Applicant argues that while the present applicant teaches the image forming characteristics of the exposure apparatuses is adjusted based on the image distortion correction capability of the other exposure apparatuses, Ushida et al and Okamoto teach correcting the same types of distortions produced by the same type stationary type exposure apparatuses. The Examiner appreciates these distinctions as described and will give them full consideration in the next office action. .